

Appendix E – Comprehensive Trail and Travel Management

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<i>E.1.</i>	<i>Introduction</i>	<i>823</i>
<i>E.1.1</i>	<i>How to Read/Use this Document.....</i>	<i>824</i>
<i>E.2.</i>	<i>Summary.....</i>	<i>824</i>
<i>E.2.1</i>	<i>Authority and Guidance for Travel Management.....</i>	<i>825</i>
<i>E.3.</i>	<i>Travel Plan Designation Process</i>	<i>826</i>
<i>E.3.1</i>	<i>Background.....</i>	<i>826</i>
<i>E.3.2</i>	<i>Interdisciplinary Team Process</i>	<i>827</i>
<i>E.3.3</i>	<i>Trails and Routes Data-Collection Workshops.....</i>	<i>827</i>
<i>E.3.4</i>	<i>Other Coordination</i>	<i>829</i>
<i>E.3.5</i>	<i>Identification of Issues</i>	<i>829</i>
<i>E.4.</i>	<i>Bakersfield FO Travel Plan Alternative Development</i>	<i>831</i>
<i>E.4.1</i>	<i>Goal.....</i>	<i>831</i>
<i>E.4.2</i>	<i>Route Designations and Interdisciplinary Team Meetings</i>	<i>832</i>
<i>E.5.</i>	<i>Proposed Plan Designations.....</i>	<i>833</i>
<i>E.6.</i>	<i>Plan Maintenance and Changes to Route Designations.....</i>	<i>836</i>
<i>E.7.</i>	<i>Implementation Process</i>	<i>837</i>
<i>E.8.</i>	<i>References.....</i>	<i>837</i>

E.1. Introduction

Comprehensive travel management is the proactive management of public access, natural resources, and regulatory needs to ensure that all aspects of road and trail system planning and management are considered. This includes route planning, inventory and evaluation, innovative partnerships, user education, mapping, monitoring, signing, field presence and law enforcement. Comprehensive travel management planning should address all resource use aspects, such as recreational, traditional, casual, agricultural, commercial, and educational, and accompanying modes and conditions of travel on public lands, not just motorized or off-highway vehicle (OHV) activities (US Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management [BLM] Land Use Planning Handbook 1601-1, Appendix C [BLM 2005]).

Throughout the BLM's planning process, scoping has consistently demonstrated comprehensive travel management as a major issue to be addressed in land use plans. Increased demand for access to public lands, combined with the research on the impacts of roads on resources and resource uses, has increased the need for a well designed and managed transportation system.

Though historically focused on motor vehicle use, comprehensive travel management encompasses all forms of transportation including travel by mechanized vehicles such as bicycles, as well as the numerous forms of motorized vehicles from two-wheeled (motorcycles) and four-wheeled such as all-terrain vehicles (ATVs) to cars and trucks.

The term off-road vehicle is an outdated term that has the same meaning as OHV, which is currently in use. Off-road vehicle is defined in 43 CFR 8340.0-5(a) as "any motorized vehicle capable of or designated for, travel on or immediately over land, water, or other natural terrain." This definition has been revised using the term "OHV" in the *National Management Strategy for Motorized Off-Highway Vehicle Use on Public Lands*, finalized by the BLM in January 2001 (BLM 2001). The intent of the National Strategy was to update and revitalize management of off-highway motor vehicle use on BLM-administered lands. The National Strategy provides guidance and recommendations to accomplish that purpose.

The Bakersfield Field Office (FO) has only recently completed an RMP decision-area-wide route inventory. The 1997 Caliente RMP did not include a route inventory and limited travel to existing routes throughout the majority of the decision area. It qualified existing routes as those appearing on BLM Surface Management Maps, aerial photographs and USGS topographical maps at the time the plan was completed. This policy was largely ineffective in addressing the proliferation of user-created routes and mitigation of environmental and social impacts.

In 2009, the BLM completed an RMP Decision Area-wide inventory that combined existing route information with updated inventories and new data. The completed "2009 Digital Inventory" compared historic maps and GIS files, previously designated routes, route information from state and local governments and current on-the-ground route inventories (completed as recently as December 2008) with recent aerial photographs. It also relied upon public input gathered at workshops and a public comment period in early 2009, described below. The process of development and content of the Bakersfield FO Travel Plan is described in this document.

Table E-1 lists the miles of routes and trails currently designated and miles of unauthorized routes in the Bakersfield FO.

Table E-1
Miles of Routes and Trails

Category	Miles
Designated Routes and Trails	978.3
Unauthorized Routes and Trails (i.e., user-created)	942.7
Total	1,921

E.1.1 How to Read/Use this Document

This document addresses the process by which the Bakersfield FO Interdisciplinary Team has developed the draft Resource Management Plan (RMP)/Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) alternatives for motorized, mechanized, and non-motorized uses throughout the planning area. This document takes the reader through the process of travel planning within the Bakersfield FO.

- The Land Use Planning decisions of the travel plan define the areas within the Bakersfield FO that are designated Open, Limited, or Closed, to OHV use.
- The Implementation decisions of the travel plan include the designation of routes throughout the decision area. Other implementation actions include signage, maps, public information, kiosks, monitoring, and working with partners.

The analysis of impacts for the travel plan will be completed within the RMP/EIS. Definitions commonly used in addressing OHV use are found in this appendix.

E.2. Summary

Land Use Planning Decisions – Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) require BLM to designate all public lands as Open, Closed or Limited for OHV use. These designations are made in the RMPs or in plan amendments. Additionally, the criteria for route designation are established in the RMP. (43 CFR Part 8340)

Implementation Decisions – The designation of routes is an implementation decision. Designation involves the selection and identification of roads and trails to be included in a travel plan system.

Route designation considerations common to all action alternatives include the following criteria, as developed by the Interdisciplinary Team in preliminary alternative-development meetings:

- In areas identified as “Limited to Designated” routes, only designated routes are open to motorized use.
- Areas and trails shall be located to minimize damage to soil, watershed, vegetation, air or other resources of the public lands, and to prevent impairment of wilderness suitability.
- Areas and trails shall be located to minimize harassment of wildlife or significant disruption of wildlife habitats. Special attention is to be given to T&E species and their habitats.
- Areas and trails shall be located to minimize conflicts between off-road vehicle use and other existing or proposed recreational uses of the same or neighboring public lands.

- Areas and trails shall be located to ensure the compatibility of such uses with populated areas, taking into account noise, safety, and other factors.
- Areas and trails shall not be located in officially designated wilderness areas or primitive areas.
- Areas and trails shall be located to ensure the compatibility with adjacent land uses and management, such as with National Forest System lands and the Carrizo Plain National Monument.
- Areas and trails will be designated and managed in accordance with the management objectives of other resources and designations (e.g., Areas of Critical Environmental Concern).
- Any fire, military, emergency or law enforcement vehicle when used for emergency purposes is exempted from OHV decisions.
- Wilderness Study Areas (WSAs) are to be designated as closed to OHV use, and must be managed and monitored to comply with the interim management policy nonimpairment standard.
- As required in 43 CFR Sec. 8342.3 (Designation changes): "The authorized officer shall monitor effects of the use of off-road vehicles. On the basis of information so obtained, and whenever the authorized officer deems it necessary to carry out the objectives of this part, designations may be amended, revised, revoked, or other actions taken pursuant to the regulations in this part."

E.2.1 Authority and Guidance for Travel Management

Alternatives have been developed based on the following authority and guidance specific to travel management for the BLM:

- Executive Order No. 11644, February 8, 1972 (37 *Federal Register* 2877) – This order established criteria by which federal agencies were to develop regulations for the management of OHVs on lands under their management. Agencies are to "monitor the effects" of OHV use on their public lands and, "on the basis of the information gathered, they shall from time to time amend or rescind designation of areas for OHV use "as necessary to further" its policy.
- Executive Order No. 11989, May 25, 1977 (42 *Federal Register* 26959) – This order amended Executive Order 11644 and authorized agencies to adopt a policy that particular lands can be considered closed to OHVs once it is determined that OHV use "will cause or is causing considerable adverse effects" to particular resources.
- 43 CFR Part 8342 – OHV Regulations that establish criteria for designating lands as Open, Limited, or Closed to the use of OHVs.
- Instruction Memorandum No. 2006-173, Implementation of Roads and Trails Terminology Report (BLM 2006).
- Instruction Memorandum No. 2008-014, Clarification of Guidance and Integration of Comprehensive Travel Transportation Management Planning into the Land Use Planning (BLM 2007).
- *National Management Strategy for Motorized Off-Highway Vehicle Use on Public Lands* (BLM 2001).

E.3. Travel Plan Designation Process

A goal of the Bakersfield FO planning process is to develop, with stakeholders, a travel plan that will provide access to public lands. The goals and objectives of the travel plan applies to all areas of travel management including access to resources, appropriate recreation opportunities that at the same time protect public land resources, ensure public safety, minimize conflicts among the various public land uses, and provide for support of the local economy.

More specifically, desired future conditions or desired outcomes are stated as goals and objectives. Goals are broad statements of desired outcomes (RMP-wide and resource or resource use specific) and generally are not quantifiable or measurable. Objectives are more-specific desired conditions or outcomes for resources to meet the resource/resource use goal. For key issues, objectives are different across alternatives; for other issues, objectives can be the same across alternatives.

Management actions and allowable uses are designed to achieve the objectives. Management actions include management measures that will guide future and day-to-day activities such as administrative designations (e.g., Areas of Critical Environmental Concern, suitable stream segments for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System), land tenure zones, and proposed withdrawals. Allowable uses indicate which uses are allowed, restricted, or prohibited, such as stipulations. Allowable uses also identify lands where specific uses are excluded to protect resource values, or where certain lands are open or closed in response to legislative, regulatory, or policy requirements.

E.3.1 Background

In the early 1980s, in response to the Presidential Executive Orders 11644 and 11989, the BLM began designating all public lands in one of three OHV designation categories. Thus public lands within the Bakersfield FO RMP planning area were designated as open, limited (limited to existing roads and trails or limited to designated roads and trails), or closed to OHV use. The designations are as follows:

Open – The BLM designates areas as "open" for intensive OHV use where there are no compelling resource protection needs, user conflicts, or public safety issues to warrant limiting cross-country travel. However, motor vehicles may not be operated in a manner causing or likely to cause significant, undue damage to or disturbance of the soil, wildlife, wildlife habitat improvements, cultural or vegetative resources or other authorized uses of the public lands (See 43 CFR 8341).

Limited – The "limited" designation is used in areas where OHV use must be restricted to meet specific resource management objectives. In the current guidance context, this means limited to designated roads and trails, i.e., a route network designated by the BLM in its RMP. These routes may also be limited to: (1) A time or season of use depending on the resources in the area (i.e., Threatened and Endangered Species' habitat or nesting areas, crucial winter ranges, etc.); and/or (2) Type of vehicle use (ATV, Motorcycle, four-wheel vehicle, etc.)

Closed – The BLM designates areas as "closed" if closure to vehicular use is necessary to protect resources, ensure visitor safety, or reduce resource or use conflicts. Access by means other than motor vehicle access is generally allowed. The Field Office Manager may allow OHV use on a case-by-case basis or for emergencies.

In the current RMP process and national guidance for the OHV Limited category designation has changed. Designating Open, Closed, and Limited areas for OHV use continues to be mandated, but

under the Limited category only the "Limited to Designated Roads and Trails" sub-category is recommended. The designation of the sub-category "Existing Roads and Trails" is no longer a recommended option. Eliminating the "Existing Roads and Trails" sub-category prevents confusion and enforcement problems concerning new unauthorized routes being created and then used by the public because they are then "existing". By policy (Instruction Memorandum No. 2008-014 [BLM 2007]), BLM discourages the use of the "Limited to Existing" category.

Through the 1997 Caliente Resource Area RMP, the BLM designated all public lands within the Bakersfield FO decision area as Closed or Limited to Designated Roads and Trails (BLM 1997). None of the decision area was designated as open and very few of the designated routes have been specified for a particular use (i.e., motorized, mechanized, or nonmotorized).

E.3.2 Interdisciplinary Team Process

The Interdisciplinary Team of BLM resource specialists in the Bakersfield FO who participated in the completion of the Comprehensive Travel Management Plan is listed in Table E-4.

**Table E-2
Bakersfield FO Interdisciplinary Team Members**

Name	Resource
Lisa Ashley	Air, Soil, Water
Kim Cuevas	Archaeology
Nora DeDios	Interim Project Manager
Peter DeWitt	Recreation, Comprehensive Trails and Travel Management, Special Designations
Karen Doran	Range
Denis Kearns	Botany
Steve Larson	Assistant Field Manager
Jeff Prude	Minerals
Chris Ryan	Fire
Larry Saslaw	Wildlife
Diane Simpson	Realty
Larry Vredenburg	Geographic Information Systems (GIS)

Between March and April 2009, the Bakersfield FO Interdisciplinary Team held meetings and workshops specifically concerning the travel plan. Throughout the process, the Bakersfield FO coordinated efforts with the Sequoia National Forest, which is also in the process of designating routes on National Forest System lands. The BLM used Sequoia National Forest's proposed route designations as a means to coordinate on routes crossing federal land boundaries. This was especially important for routes in the Lake Isabella area where some National Forest routes require access across BLM-administered public lands.

E.3.3 Trails and Routes Data-Collection Workshops

The BLM hosted two trails and routes data-collection workshops, one in Lake Isabella (February 25, 2009) and one in Taft (February 26, 2009). The workshops were held to allow the public to (1) review the BLM's inventory for accuracy and completeness; (2) provide information on routes that are missing from

the BLM's inventory; and (3) offer suggestions for reroutes or new trail sections that would complement the existing route system. These workshops focused specifically on the Lake Isabella and Taft areas. Table E-5 shows the date, location, and number of attendees for each workshop. Both meetings were from 6:00 pm to 8:00 pm.

Table E-3
Trails and Routes Data Collection Workshop Attendance

Location (California)	Date	Number of Attendees
Lake Isabella Lake Isabella Moose Lodge 6732 Lake Isabella Boulevard	February 25, 2009	44
Taft Taft Union High School 701 7 th Street	February 26, 2009	14
Total		58

Both open houses were structured in a similar format. Attendees were asked to sign in and a brief PowerPoint presentation was given by BLM representatives about the travel management and route designation process and the goals and objectives of the workshop. A comment form and handout with a brief overview of the travel management planning process were available to all attendees.

An overview map was displayed at the entrance of the room that showed the Field Office boundary and the different travel management zones within the Field Office. The Lake Isabella area was divided into 12 arbitrary travel management zones, which were labeled A through L. The Taft area was divided into six arbitrary travel management zones, which were labeled A through F. Dividing each recreation area into a number of management zones enabled the public to focus on a specific area of interest and locate routes more easily.

Work stations were set up around the room with topographic-based maps displaying the inventoried trails and routes for each zone. Attendees were asked to complete a comment form and draw on the maps to document any missing existing trails and routes. Proposed new routes were also drawn on the maps. Pencils and markers were available to edit the maps.

The comment period for routes and trails data collection was open until March 13, 2009. The public could submit comments by completing the comment form and sending it via email, US mail, facsimile, or hand delivery to the Bakersfield FO. Copies of all travel management zone maps and comment forms were available at the two workshops and at the Bakersfield FO.

A total of seven submissions were received by the deadline of March 13, 2009, which includes all comment forms, e-mails, and letters. The BLM received one submission via the comment form, one letter submission, and five submissions via e-mail. Some written submissions included numerous comments, overlapping comments, and incomplete comments. As such, the seven submissions contained numerous unique comments. Most comments gave information on the purpose and the individuals' use of the routes. Other comments expressed support of or opposition to Bakersfield FO policies related to travel management. One submission provided GPS data to fill in a missing route. A record of comments received is part of the administrative record for the RMP revision process.

E.3.4 Other Coordination

The BLM also extended invitations to local agencies, user groups, and permittees to discuss the route designation process. The BLM met with Stewards of the Sequoia, California Off-road Vehicle Association, the Taft Motorcycle Club, and a representative of Kern County. Grazing permittees were also consulted regarding their usage of routes related to grazing practices.

In June 2009, the Bakersfield FO presented its route designation maps to the OHV sub-group to the Central California Resource Advisory Council.

E.3.5 Identification of Issues

Travel management issues were identified by BLM resource specialists in the preparation plan, through the public scoping process, and by input from the public during scoping for the RMP and specifically for travel management planning.

BLM staff identified the following factors describing the condition of travel management within the planning area, thereby identifying the need for developing a Comprehensive Travel Management plan.

- The 1997 RMP for the Caliente Resource Area is inadequate to address the rapid expansion of recreational vehicle use and visitation on public lands;
- Lack of planning for OHV recreation activities in popular areas, such as the Keyesville, Taft, and Tehachapi;
- The lack of legal access to public lands, through ROWs and easements, where public land is isolated within privately owned areas;
- Unauthorized creation of “bandit” routes causing impacts on other resources; and
- Growing conflicts among recreational users.

Scoping for the RMP revealed some disagreement about how best to maintain the route system within the Bakersfield FO. Some desire the network to be maintained or improved and expanded. Opposing this sentiment were comments recommending stricter controls on access, particularly with concern for off-road vehicle uses. Closing and restoring redundant or unnecessary roads, and leaving some roads unpaved to help maintain the Bakersfield RMP area’s undeveloped character was also requested. Specific requests included more single track access only and increased development of this type of trails. Many comments were received expressing a desire for additional OHV opportunities on public lands.

Developing Planning Criteria

Considerations of both social and physical elements help define the criteria for a travel plan. Social aspects include public demands, historical uses, existing rights-of-way, permitted uses, public access, resource development, law enforcement and safety, conflicts between existing or potential uses, recreation opportunities, local uses, cultural and economic issues. Physical aspects include the terrain, soils, water, vegetation, and watersheds, connectedness of routes, special designations, demands for specific types of vehicle use, and manageability considerations.

The BLM will manage access on public lands in accordance with existing law, executive orders, proclamation, regulation, and policy. General planning criteria for the RMP process includes:

- Laws – The plan will comply with all applicable laws and regulations, and will analyze the effects of the alternatives in an EIS in compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA).
- Decisions – All decisions made in the RMP will only apply to public lands administered by the BLM.
- Existing Rights – The plan recognizes current, valid existing rights.

Specific to the travel plan, the criteria include:

- National OHV Policy – Decisions regarding OHV travel will be consistent with the BLM's National OHV Strategy.
- RS 2477 – Rights-of-way may exist across the Bakersfield FO, although adjudication is beyond the scope of this RMP.

OHV Designation Criteria

BLM's designation of OHV use areas is guided by 43 CFR 8342.1, which states that designations shall be based on the protection of resources, the promotion of the safety of all users of public lands, and the minimization of land use conflicts. Minimization criteria are defined in 43 CFR 8342.1:

- [Designated] areas and [designated] trails shall be located in a manner to minimize impacts to physical resources (soils, watershed, vegetation, air, and other resources) and to prevent impairment of wilderness suitability;
- [Designated] areas and [designated] trails shall be located to minimize harassment of wildlife or significant disruption of wildlife habitats. Special attention will be given to protect endangered or threatened species and their habitats;
- [Designated] areas and [designated] trails shall be located to minimize conflicts between off-road vehicle use and other existing or proposed recreation uses, and to ensure the compatibility of such uses with existing conditions in populated area; and
- [Designated] areas and [designated] trails shall not be located in officially designated wilderness areas or primitive areas, and shall be located in natural areas only if the authorized officer determines that off-road vehicle use in such locations will not adversely affect their natural, esthetic, scenic, or other values for which established.

Bakersfield FO Considerations for Travel Plan

In addition to the criteria defined in 43 CFR 8342.1, preliminary screening criteria that were considered during the route designation process, and would be considered during future route modifications, include the following:

1. Resource concerns. This includes soil stability, special wildlife habitat, visual resources, cultural and paleontological resources, special management areas, etc.
2. Route conditions. This includes route use, route purpose, and parallel or duplicate routes.
3. Public concerns such as noise abatement and urban buffer zones.

Route Designations in Wilderness Study Areas

Information Bulletin No. 99-181 (BLM 1999) directs BLM to comply with the wilderness nonimpairment mandate (Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976, Section 603(c)). BLM must monitor and regulate the activities of off-highway vehicles in WSAs to assure that their use does not compromise these areas by impairing their suitability for designation as wilderness. The BLM's Off Road Vehicle Regulations (43 CFR 8342.1) require that BLM establish off-road vehicle designations of areas and routes that meet the non-impairment mandate. It is the BLM's policy that cross-country vehicle use in the WSAs does cause the impairment of wilderness suitability. The Bakersfield FO has decided to close all routes in WSAs to meet the non-impairment standard.

Administrative Access and Use

Routes considered for Administrative Use Only were discussed by the Interdisciplinary Team. These administrative categories could include routes to stock ponds and other range improvements, guzzlers, and BLM facilities. The Bakersfield FO reserves the right to allow travel on these routes to permittees, BLM employees, or whomever it deems appropriate on a case-by-case basis.

Emergency Uses

By regulation, any fire, military, emergency or law enforcement vehicle when used for emergency purposes is exempted from OHV decisions. Emergency uses in Wilderness and WSAs are covered in BLM Manual 8560, Management of Designated Wilderness Areas (BLM 1983) and BLM Handbook H-8550-1, Interim Management Policy for Lands Under Wilderness Review (BLM 1995), respectively.

Emergency Limitations or Closures

Whenever the authorized officer determines that OHV use will cause or is causing considerable adverse effects on resources (i.e., soil, vegetation, wildlife, wildlife habitat, cultural, historic, scenic, recreation, or other resources), the area must be immediately closed to the type of use causing the adverse effects (43 CFR 8341.2). Such limitation or closures are not OHV designations.

E.4. Bakersfield FO Travel Plan Alternative Development

As part of the BLM's RMP revisions process, the BLM is developing a complementary travel management plan for all BLM-administered lands within the Bakersfield FO. The revised RMP will comprehensively plan for all types of travel (recreational, casual, agricultural, industrial, administrative, etc.) and accompanying modes and conditions of travel, including motorized, mechanized, and nonmechanized (muscle-powered) uses.

E.4.1 Goal

The goal of the travel plan is to provide opportunities for a range of motorized and nonmotorized access and recreation experiences on public lands while protecting sensitive resources and minimizing conflicts among various users.

This process includes preparing a range of alternatives for inclusion in the draft RMP/EIS. The BLM will provide a range of alternatives as to which areas of the Bakersfield FO will be Closed to OHV travel and

which areas will be limited to Designated Routes. BLM will provide a range of alternatives by varying miles of closed and designated routes.

E.4.2 Route Designations and Interdisciplinary Team Meetings

Interdisciplinary Team meetings to address route/resource conflicts and route designations were held in March and April 2009 in which each route proposed for designation within the Bakersfield FO, including the Lake Isabella and Taft areas, was evaluated.

The purpose of the route designation Interdisciplinary Team meetings was three-fold:

1. Gather input from Interdisciplinary Team on conflicts identified and mitigation proposed by each resource specialist. Identify (where known) the purpose and need for the route in question. Where conflicts with resources existed, these conflicts were discussed and resolved during the meeting, and final proposals for the various alternatives were established.
2. Formulate three action alternatives for the travel plan: The conservation alternative emphasizes resource conflicts over the purpose and need for the route. The development alternative emphasizes the purpose and need for the route over resource conflicts. The blended alternative weighs both resource conflicts and the purpose and need.
3. Develop a designed system of designated routes that fulfills the management goal for the planning area.

The RMP administrative record contains details of the conflicts identified for each route or route segment and BLM's conclusions as to designation.

Motorized Routes

Motorized travel includes standard passenger vehicles on maintained roads and OHVs on primitive roads and trails. OHVs include off-road motorcycles, ATVs, jeeps, specialized 4x4 trucks, and snowmobiles.

Motorized-Authorized Routes

Use of authorized routes requires a permit or other form of authorization from the BLM.

Nonmotorized Routes

Nonmotorized use includes moving by foot, stock or pack animal, nonmotorized boat, or mechanical vehicle such as bicycles that are not motorized. The Bakersfield FO concluded that routes not designated for motorized travel generally would be available for nonmotorized and nonmechanized travel. As with all designations in the travel plan, BLM reserves the right to change designations in the future, should resource issues warrant such action.

Nonmechanized

Nonmechanized travel by includes travel by natural means, such as by foot or horseback. Mechanical vehicles, such as bicycles, are not permitted on nonmechanized routes, except for approved, nonmotorized ADA accessible devices.

Nonmechanized-Pedestrian

Nonmechanized travel by foot only.

Closed Routes

Closed routes are routes that are not available for public or administrative uses. Closed routes can be restored.

E.5. Proposed Plan Designations

The following table (Table E-6) provides an example of the information available in electronic format on the disc and website regarding the Proposed Plan Route Designations³. The complete table (Route Designation Justification) identifies each specific route by a unique number (Route Segment Number) and the rationale supporting the proposed designation. This table should be used with the Google Earth files provided on the accompanying map disc and available from the website to geospatially identify where each route occurs.

The rationale is broken down into two components the justification category and then additional notes concerning the route. The rationale categories used are as follows;

OHV Closed Area – Non-Discretionary

This category is used to capture all routes in non-discretionary OHV closed areas (e.g., designated Wilderness). Within these areas we have both “Closed” (trespass routes), “Authorized” (grandfathered-in or valid existing rights routes) and “Non-Mechanized” (hiking/horseback riding trails). Motorized routes would not appear with this justification category, but could potentially have Non-motorized routes (mountain-biking).

OHV Closed Area – Discretionary

This category is used to capture all routes in discretionary OHV closed areas (e.g., some ACECs). As above there are non-motorized, authorized and closed routes within this category. This category is only use for those areas designated as OHV Closed areas by an RMP (or similar Land Use Planning level document).

³ This document contains approximately 7,000 records which are best viewed electronically. Those without access to the computer equipment needed to view the document can review the document at the Bakersfield Field Office.

Resource Concern – Biology

This category is used when the justification for a route limitation hinges on a biological resource. Examples are route closures to reduce habitat fragmentation or limited seasonal use for breeding seasons. I've also used this justification when a route has been designated as authorized use only specifically identified for the benefit of biological resources e.g., authorized access to a wildlife guzzler.

Resource Concern – Cultural

This category is used when the justification for a route limitation hinges on a cultural resource. Examples are route closures due to proximity to an "eligible" archeological site.

Resource Concern – Air, Soil, Water

This category is used when the justification for a route limitation hinges on Air, Soil or Water. Examples are route restriction associated with riparian crossing, route closures or restrictions to reduce erosion, or route restrictions to reduce particulate (PM10/PM2.5) matter.

Resource Concern – Other

This category is used as a catch-all for every other resource based justification. For Bakersfield we've used this for some routes in at our Atwell Island Restoration Project (these could have equally been put in the Biology category) and some fire related routes – I have toyed with the idea of eliminating this category replacing it with "Resource Concern – Fire" and putting those other routes into the Biology section.

Resource Use Concern – Access

This category is used when the justification for a route designation is based on continued access to public lands or restricted access to authorized users only. We've used this as the justification for many of the "Motorized" route designations when there is little or no knowledge concerning the 'value' of the route, but the route is clearly well used and sustainable with no other resource concerns.

Resource Use Concern – Recreation

This category is used when the justification for a route designation hinges on a recreation value (experience/opportunity). Routes with every designation appear within this category, for example; a closed designation may be justified under this category when its closure is related to maintaining the Recreation Opportunity Spectrum's "Primitive Setting"; a non-motorized designation may be justified as enhancing mountain-bike opportunities; an authorized only route may be justified if it's only usable by SRP holders. Many "Motorized" route occur here when there is specific knowledge of the technical challenge, or access/scenic experiences provided by the route.

Resource Use Concern – Safety

This category is used when the justification for a route limitation hinges on public safety. In Bakersfield this designation justification category is most commonly encountered in the producing oil fields and other heavily industrialized areas.

Table E-6
Example Route Designation Justifications (Complete table available electronically)

Route Segment Number	Length (Miles)	Proposed Primary Designation	Proposed Secondary Restriction	Justification Category	Designation Notes	Route Classification
866	0.13	Closed		Resource Use Concern - Safety	Accesses mining site	To Be Restored
871	0.10	Closed		OHV Closed Area - Discretionary	Route enters Moses WSA.	To Be Restored
1101	0.10	Motorized		Resource Use Concern - Access	Route required for access to, from and across public lands	Primitive Road
1720	0.55	Closed		Resource Concern - Biology	Protect ACEC relevance criteria (Special Status Plant Species)	To Be Restored
2144	2.06	Non-Mechanized	Pedestrian Only	Resource Use Concern - Recreation	Closed to motorized/mechanized to promote recreation opportunity (wildlife watching).	Trail
2212	0.12	Closed		Resource Concern - Air, Soil, Water	Route steepness results in unsustainable route.	To Be Restored
2224	0.10	Motorized		Resource Use Concern - Recreation	Route within Special Recreation Management Area primarily used for recreation.	Trail
2336	0.12	Motorized	Street Legal Only	Resource Use Concern - Recreation	Restricted to 'Street Legal' vehicles only to meet recreation objectives.	Primitive Road
2528	0.04	Motorized	Authorized	Resource Concern - Cultural	Access to Keyes Mine (same route as 2523)	Primitive Road
2800	0.17	Closed		OHV Closed Area - Non-Discretionary	Trespass route enters Domeland Wilderness Area.	To Be Restored
2853	0.08	Motorized		Resource Use Concern - Access	Route required for access to, from and across public lands	Primitive Road
5417	0.00	Motorized	Authorized	Resource Use Concern - Safety	Routes within intensively developed (>1 well/acres) industrial area.	Primitive Road

E.6. Plan Maintenance and Changes to Route Designations

The RMP should include indicators to guide future plan maintenance, amendments, or revisions related to OHV area designations or the approved road and trail system within Limited areas (Instruction Memorandum No. 2008-014, Attachment 1 [BLM 2007]). Indicators could include results of monitoring data, new information, or changed circumstances.

Modifications to area OHV designations (open, closed, or limited) require an amendment to the RMP. Actual route designations can be modified without completing a plan amendment, although NEPA compliance is still required. The Federal regulations at 43 CFR 8342.3 state: “The authorized officer shall monitor effect of the use of off-road vehicles. On the basis of information so obtained, and whenever the authorized officer deems it necessary to carry out the objectives of this part, designations may be amended, revised, revoked, or other action taken pursuant to the regulation in this part.”

Within the RMP, the Bakersfield FO must establish procedures for making modifications to their designated route networks. Because future conditions may require the designation or construction of new routes or closure of routes in order to better address resources and resource use conflicts, the Bakersfield FO will expressly state how modification would be evaluated.

Plan maintenance can be accomplished through additional analysis and land use planning, e.g., activity level planning. BLM will collaborate with affected and interested parties in evaluating the designated road and trail network for suitability for active OHV management and envisioning potential changes in the existing system or adding new trails that would help meet current and future demands. In conducting such evaluations, the following factors would be considered:

- Routes suitable for different categories of OHVs including dirt bikes, ATVs, dune buggies, and 4-wheel drive touring vehicles, as well as opportunities for joint trail use;
- Needs for parking, trailheads, informational and directional signs, mapping and profiling, and development of brochures or other materials for public dissemination;
- Opportunities to tie into existing or planned route networks;
- Measures needed to avoid onsite and offsite impacts to current and future land uses and important natural resources; among others, issues include noise and air pollution, erodible soils, stream sedimentation, non-point source water pollutions, listed and sensitive species' habitats, historic and archeological sites, wildlife, special management areas, grazing operations, fence and gate security, needs of non-motorized recreationists, and recognition of property rights for adjacent landowners; and
- Public land roads or trails determined to cause considerable adverse effects or to constitute a nuisance or threat to public safety would be considered for relocation or closure and rehabilitation after appropriate coordination with applicable agencies and partners.

Those areas managed as Closed will not be available for new motorized or mechanized route designation or construction.

Regulations at 43 CFR 8342.2 require BLM to monitor the effects of OHV use. Changes should be made to the Travel Plan based on the information obtained through monitoring. Procedures for making changes to route designations after the ROD is signed are established in the RMP.

Site specific NEPA documentation is required in order to change the route designations in this Travel Plan.

E.7. Implementation Process

Implementation decisions are actions to implement land use plans and generally constitute BLM's final approval allowing on-the-ground actions to proceed. These types of decisions are based on site-specific planning and NEPA analyses and are subject to the administrative remedies set forth in the regulations that apply to each resource management program of the BLM. Implementation decisions are not subject to protest under the planning regulations.

Instead, implementation decisions are subject to various administrative remedies. Where implementation decisions are made as part of the land use planning process, they are still subject to the appeals process of other administrative review as prescribed by specific resource program regulations after BLM resolves the protests to land use plan decisions and make a decision to adopt or amend the RMP.

Travel planning and implementation process includes the following:

- A map of roads and trails for all travel modes.
- Definitions and additional limitations for specific roads and trails.
- Criteria developed to set parameters and to specify limitations.
- Guidelines for management, monitoring, and maintenance of the system.
- Indicators to guide future plan maintenance, amendments or revisions related to OHV area designations or the approved road and trail system within limited areas.

The travel management networks should be reviewed periodically to ensure that current resource and travel management objectives are being met (43 CFR 8342.3).

In the final RMP decisions, designated OHV routes will be portrayed by a map entitled "Field Office Travel Plan and Map". This map will be the basis for signing and enforcement. The Field Office will prioritize actions, resources, and geographic areas for implementation. The implementation goals include completing signage, maps, public information, kiosks, and working with partners.

E.8. References

43 C.F.R. Part 8340

BLM (US Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management). 1983. Manual 8560, Management of Designated Wilderness Areas. BLM, Washington, DC. April 27, 1983.

_____. 1995. Interim Management Policy for Lands Under Wilderness Review, H-8550-1. BLM, Portland, Oregon. July 5, 1995.

- _____. 1997. Proposed Resource Management Plan and Final Environmental Impact Statement for the Caliente Resource Area. BLM, Bakersfield District. 1997.
- _____. 1999. Information Bulletin No. 99-181. Off Highway Vehicle Use in Wilderness Study Areas. July 13, 1999.
- _____. 2001. National Management Strategy for Motorized Off-Highway Vehicle Use on Public Lands. BLM, Washington, DC. January 2001. 54 pp.
- _____. 2005. Land Use Planning Handbook, H-1601-1. BLM, Washington, DC. March 11, 2005. 161 pp.
- _____. 2006. Instruction Memorandum No. 2006-173. Implementation of Roads and Trails Terminology Report. June 16, 2006.
- _____. 2007. Instruction Memorandum No. 2008-014. Clarification of Guidance and Integration of Comprehensive Travel and Transportation Management Planning into the Land Use Planning. October 24, 2007.

Executive Order No. 11644, February 8, 1972

Executive Order No. 11989, May 25, 1977